

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In connection with the Request for Continued Examination filed June 13, 2005 and the telephonic interview of July 13, 2005 associated therewith, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office enter the amendments set forth above and consider the following remarks. By this response, claim 6 is amended, new claims 27-32 are added, and no claims are canceled. After entry of this paper, claims 3-8, 10-15 and 17-32 will be pending in this application.

With regard to the Office's most recent rejections, in the Office Action of January 11, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 3-8, 10-15 and 17-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,115,506 to Cohen *et al.* ("Cohen").

Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), RCE and Interview

Claims 3-8, 10-15 and 17-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), to which Applicants filed a request for reconsideration (with RCE) on June 13, 2005. On July 13, 2005, Applicant had a telephonic interview with the Examiner. Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview and the interview summary mailed July 15, 2005. This summary is in accord with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), and thus no further written statement regarding this interview is believed necessary at this time.

In response to the above-referenced rejection, Applicant disagrees and incorporates by reference all of Applicant's earlier arguments (e.g., in Applicant's Responses dated 3/29/04, 10/27/04 and 6/13/05) here. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Cohen fails to teach or suggest the portioning of registers as previously recited in all of the independent claims. Without acquiescing, Applicant has nevertheless made various amendments to the claims and added new claims to further obviate this rejection. Specifically, independent claims 6, 11, 12, 14, 17, 20, and 23 have been amended to recited either "dedicated exception registers that are switched for a subset of said set of general purpose registers during servicing of an exception," or "wherein during servicing of an exception, a subset of

registers are not replaced with an alternate set and the registers that are not replaced with an alternate set allow data sharing between exception processing and normal execution.” Therefore, in accord with the reasons set forth in Applicant’s prior Responses and as articulated during the interview of July 13, 2005, Applicant submits that all of these claims are patentable over Cohen.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Cohen does not anticipate independent claims 6, 11, 12, 14, 17, 20, and 23. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 3-5, 7-8, 10, 13, 15, 18-19, 21-22, and 24-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 6, 12, 14, 17 and 20 and therefore include all elements of their respective independent claims. These dependent claims are therefore also not anticipated by Cohen for at least the same reasons stated above. Applicant therefore requests the rejection of claims 3-5, 7-8, 10, 13, 15, 18-19, 21-22, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

New Claims

Additionally, Applicant submits that new claims 27-32 do not raise new issues, present new matter or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search because all of these claims recite subject matter disclosed in and inherent to the claims already examined. Therefore, the subject matter of the newly presented claims has already been before the Office, and no new matter or issues are presented by this amendment and response. The new claims are also allowable, inter alia, because they include the recitations discussed above as even more positively imparting patentability over the Cohen reference. New claims 27-32 are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth previously with respect to independent claims 6, 11, 12, 14, 17, 20, and 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request allowance of new claims 27-32.

Appln. No. 09/515,358
Amdt. filed July 25, 2005, submitted re: RCE
of 6/13/05 and telephone interview of 7/13/05

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 9145.0003-00


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 25, 2005

By: 
Andrew B. Schwaab
Reg. No. 38,611

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner L.L.P.
901 New York Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Attorney direct (650) 849-6643